DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 852 RC 005 545

AUTHOR	Patella, Victoria M.
TITLE	How Mexican Is a Spanish-Speaking Mexican American?
INSTITUTION	Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 71
NOTE	49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Denver, Colorado, August 1971
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingualism, Ethnic Stereotypes, Family (Sociological Unit), *Followup Studies, *Grade 10, Identification (Psychological), *Language Usage, *Mexican Americans, *Sociocultural Patterns, Sociolinguistics, Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS	Texas

ABSTRACT

To investigate the validity of language usage as an indicator of identification with the Mexican American subculture, this study hypothesized that greater use of Spanish than English would be correlated with characteristics consistent with the ideal, typical, Mexican American family in terms of family of orientation and aspirations for future family of procreation. Data from Kuvlesky and Patella's 1967 study of about 600 Mexican American high school sophomores in South Texas (cf. related document, ED 040 777) were used. With a few exceptions, the hypothesis was not supported; however, the exceptions indicated that language usage may well be correlated with certain attitudes, behaviors, and other subtle characteristics that cannot be known without further investigation. Implications were drawn for theory, past and future research, methodology, and social policy, particularly in the educational realm (e.g., teachers must not assume that language usage patterns indicate other aspects of the student's attitudes and values). [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document]. (Author/BO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HOW MEXICAN IS A SPANISH-SPEAKING MEXICAN AMERICAN?*

Victoria M. Patella
Texas A&M University

RECEIVED
AUG 30 1971
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

ED053852

Abstract

This study follows up on Kuvlesky and Patella's earlier paper, "Strength of Ethnic Identification and Intergenerational Mobility Aspirations among Mexican American Youth" (1970), which was based upon two assumptions: Parsons' description of the Mexican American subculture as particularistic-ascriptive, and the validity of language usage as an indicator of ethnic identification. They hypothesized that degree of identification with the Mexican American subculture (as measured by language usage) is inversely related to desire for upward intergenerational mobility. The first of these two assumptions being considered valid, this study examines the second, which, though widely accepted by sociolinguists, has been challenged occasionally. The aim here is to determine the correlation between language usage, as indicated by an index of use of Spanish versus use of English in a variety of situations, and other presumed indicators of ethnicity for the Mexican American subculture. These indicators of ethnicity are in two areas: characteristics of family of orientation and aspirations for future family of procreation. It was hypothesized that characteristics in these two areas which are consistent with the ideal typical Mexican American family would be correlated with a high index of language usage, that is, with greater use of Spanish than English. This study used the Kuvlesky and Patella data from a 1967 study of about 600 Mexican American high school sophomores in South Texas. With a few exceptions, the hypothesis was not supported. It was concluded that in general language usage is not a valid indicator of ethnicity as it is described by the indicators used here. The exceptions indicate that language usage may well be correlated with certain attitudes, behaviors and other subtle characteristics, but the precise identity of these can not be known without further investigation; they can by no means be assumed as they often are. Implications are drawn for theory, past and future research, methodology, and social policy, particularly in the educational realm.

*Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Denver, August, 1971. This research was supported by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to its research project H-2611. This project contributes to USDA, CSRS regional research project S-61, "Human Resource Development and Mobility in the Rural South."

RC005545

THE PROBLEM

This study stems from the unexpected outcome of an investigation by Kuvlesky and Patella (1970) dealing with intergenerational mobility aspirations of Mexican American youth. Kuvlesky and Patella hypothesized that the more strongly an individual identified with the ascriptive mother culture (identification was measured by an index of Spanish language use), the less likely he would be to desire upward mobility. The hypothesis, based upon Parsons' description of the Mexican American subculture as particularistic-ascriptive, and upon the validity of language usage as an indicator of ethnic identification, was not upheld. As the former assumption still seems a reasonable one, the latter is being questioned here. The hypothesis under test is the following: Relative use of the Spanish language versus the English language is directly correlated with identification with the ethnic subculture.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature must be examined in two areas: language usage in relation to culture, and the nature of the Mexican American subculture. With respect to the first of these, sociolinguistic and sociological theorists and researchers have long assumed that language usage patterns of bilingual groups of people directly reflect people's relative involvement with the ethnic mother culture and the second culture. Joshua Fishman (1966:25), in his comprehensive theoretical and empirical study of language loyalty

of various ethnic groups in the United States, generally equates maintenance of the mother tongue with identification with the ethnic subculture. Likewise do numerous other theorists (Kroeber, 1964:vii; Christian and Christian, 1966:300; Leach, 1966:32; Hoijer, 1964:456). Empirical investigators as well generally assume that language usage is a valid indicator of ethnic identification (Lambert, 1966:483; Heller, 1961:31; Hayden, 1966; Kloss, 1966:212). However, their basic assumption has been challenged occasionally, and has been proved to be invalid for many ethnic subgroups around the world. Often ethnic identity and unity and maintenance of the mother tongue have been separated so that one exists without the other. Kloss (1962:212) points out a possible reason for this: "A high degree of ethnic pride and self-reliance may, at first glance, seem definitely favorable to language maintenance. Actually these characteristics may hasten the process of assimilation since they may lead to the view that group life can be maintained without linguistic continuity." Examples of cases in which language and ethnicity have gone their separate ways may be found in Johnston (1966: 449), Weinreich (1953:100), Fishman and Nahirny (1954), Hohenthal and McCorkle (1955:288-300) and many others. An extensive body of literature explores the numerous variables which affect language choice at a given moment or in terms of general patterns of usage. Fishman provides a useful (although not complete) synthesis of these in his schema of domains of language usage (Figure 1).

The literature on the Mexican American subculture is primarily

FIGURE I

Fishman's Schema of Domains, Sources of Variance, and Media of Language Usage.

Media	Role	Situation	Family	Neighborhood: Friends	Neighborhood: Acquaints.	Mass Med.	Ethnic Orgs.	Occup.
Speak.	Inner	Formal						
		Informal						
		Intimate						
	Comp.	Formal	X	X		X		X
		Informal	X	X		X		X
		Intimate	X	X		X		X
	Prod.	Formal	X	X				X
		Informal	X	X				X
		Intimate	X	X				X
Read.	Comp.	Formal				X		
		Informal				X		
		Intimate				X		
	Prod.	Formal						
		Informal						
		Intimate						
Writ.	Prod.	Formal						
		Informal						
		Intimate						

descriptive and subjective to date, but the picture it provides is quite consistent. This review will focus on those aspects of the subculture which will form the foundation for the specific empirical hypotheses of this study; due to the limitations of the data, it will center on the family. To begin, the source of the culture, and a prime force in its maintenance, is Mexico (Edmonson, 1957: 52; Gonzalez, 1967:29). Parsons describes the culture as particularistic-ascriptive (1951:200) and thus very traditionalistic. The ties to family overshadow all others (Rubel, 1966:55). The principle of male dominance is basic (1966:59) and the father is the center of authority and responsibility (Christian and Christian, 1966:302). The ethic of "machismd' is central to the upbringing of the young boy (Heller, 1969:35). It is an image of the ideal male which "includes sexual prowess, physical strength, adventurousness and courage, male dominance, self-confidence and verbal articulation." But, according to Christian and Christian,

> The division of labor between the sexes is sharply defined. It is not considered proper for women to work outside the home or for men to engage in household activities... The Mexican woman traditionally had no other concept of her role or function than as a housekeeper with children (1966:302). Since she rarely uses effective methods of birth control, it is expected that she will bear children regularly, leaving no time for work outside the home even were it otherwise permissible (1966:305).

Likewise "the girl is trained for the home, the boy for the world (Tuck, 1946:124). Catholicism continues to be the predominant religion and to exert a powerful influence on the family (Heller, 1966:17-19). The Mexican American is typically traditionalistic

in his religion as in other realms of his life, and thus the church's proscription of use of birth control measures is followed carefully and families tend to be large. Likewise divorce is proscribed (Gonzalez, 1969:129). Education is not stressed in the subculture, and is recommended even less for girls than for boys (Rubel, 1966:68).

SOURCE AND COLLECTION OF DATA*

The data were collected in the spring of 1967 in two southwest Texas counties - Dimmit and Maverick - and two South Texas counties - Starr and Zapata. The subjects were sophomores in the seven high schools of these counties. These counties were selected for the larger research project in that the populations were predominantly Mexican American, economically depressed and predominantly rural and/or non-metropolitan. They are especially appropriate to this study as they are on or near the Mexican border, and thus the subjects are in a position to identify with either culture. There is a great deal of variability among the seven schools in terms of size, curricula offerred, nature of the students, and many other characteristics. The youth interviewed for this study comprised nine-tenths of those enrolled in the seven schools at the time. High school sophomores were used in order to

---

*Information concerning the source and collection of data is drawn from the thesis of David W. Wright, Jr. (1968).

provide maximum comparability with other related studies.

The schedule utilized in this study was pretested during the summer of 1965 on selected Negro and white male and female high school students in Bryan and College Station, Texas. An 18-page revised schedule was administered to high school students in selected East Texas counties, and in two other Southern states in the spring of 1966. The schedule was then revised to the final 12-page form employed in the collection of data for the study of which this study is a part. The data collection took place in May, 1967, and was performed by means of group interviews conducted by trained graduate students in the selected schools. The interviewers were introduced to the subjects as representatives of Texas A&M University who were studying youth in Texas. One of the interviewers read each question aloud as the respondents answered on the questionnaire. Both the respondents and the school officials were informed beforehand that all responses would be confidential: names and addresses of the respondents were collected only for the use of the researchers. Administration of the questionnaire took from 35 to 70 minutes, with the pace being altered as appropriate for each group of interviewers. The subjects included all students present on the day of the interview (669 of the 765 sophomores) who were identified as Mexican American by means of four items on the questionnaire. There were 290 males and 306 females.

FRAMEWORK

As mentioned above this data involves only certain aspects of family. The two major areas of consideration are the following: 1) Characteristics of the family of orientation, in particular, contact with Mexico, roles of the parents and working of women outside the home, divorce, and education; and 2) Aspirations for future family of procreation, in particular, importance of family relative to other goals and involvements, desire to marry, ideal family size, and working of women outside the home. The basic assumption in each case will be that an individual who is from a more typical Mexican American family or who aspires to have a more typical Mexican American family of his own would be more strongly identified with the subculture than an individual who is from a less typical Mexican American family or who aspires to have a less typical one. In accordance with the hypothesis being tested here, the former individual would have a stronger preference for Spanish than the latter.

INDICATORS AND MEASUREMENTS*

Language Usage

Respondents were asked six questions concerning their use of language: 1) Do you speak Spanish? 2) What language do you usually use when speaking with your parents? 3) What language do you usu-

---

*All instruments may be found at the conclusion of the paper.

ally use when talking with your close friends in your neighborhood? 4) What language do you usually use when speaking with your close friends outside of class? 5) How many of the radio programs you listen to are broadcast in Spanish? and 6) How many of the magazines and newspapers which you read are in Spanish? Fishman's schema provides a basis for evaluating the extent to which the available data on language usage may be expected to tap the universe (Figure 1). As the filled boxes indicate, in this study which did not differentiate among situations, the data comprise only 8 cells (or 8 blocks of 3 cells each). The data are thus somewhat limited, being heavily weighted in favor of the speaking medium over reading, with writing totally neglected. They include both comprehension and production roles, with some emphasis on comprehension, but completely neglect the inner role. However, they do include four of the six domains.

It was decided to combine the five indicators of language usage (excluding the first question) into an index to allow broader generalization. Contrary to the method used by Kuvlesky and Patella (1970) which weighted all five items equally, it was decided that it would be less arbitrary to weight the interaction context (the first three of the five items) equally against the non-interaction context (the last two). A preliminary analysis of inter-item correlations was performed in order to determine whether or not any two items might be tapping the same things (Table 1-4), and thus to avoid giving undue weight to some aspect in one of the halves of the index. The

Table 1. Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 29b, Language Used with Parents and 29c, Language Used with Close Friends in Neighborhood.

29b	29c Response 1	2	3	Total
Response 1	22	1	12	35
2	20	205	163	388
3	41	32	100	173
Total	83	238	275	596

$X^2 = 138.73^*$

Table 2. Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 29b, language Used with Parents, and 29d, Language Used with Close Friends Outside Class.

29d	29d Response 1	2	3	Total
Response 1	31	1	7	39
2	60	114	197	371
3	66	12	108	186
Total	157	127	312	596

$X^2 = 99.6^*$

*This value is significant at $P<.01$.

Table 3. Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 29c, Language Used with Close Friends in Neighborhood, and 29d, Language Used with Friends Outside Class.

29b	29d Response 1	2	3	Total
Response 1	63	1	18	82
2	22	108	108	238
3	72	18	186	276
Total	157	127	312	596

$x^2 = 405$*

Table 4. Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 30, Radio Programs Listened to, and 31, Magazines and Newspapers Read.

30	31 Response 1	2	3 or 4	Total
Response 1	128	23	2	153
2	170	146	3	319
3 or 4	33	67	24	124
Total	331	236	26	596

$x^2 = 186.54$*

*This value is significant at $P<.01$.

interaction items, the first three, were examined for correlation in pairs, and the two non-interaction items against each other. On the basis of the chi-square values obtained, all of which were extremely high, it was concluded that there was a high dependence among all the first three items and a high dependence also between the fourth and fifth items. Thus the index was formulated by drawing half of its weight from the first three items and half from the last two.

Family: Characteristics of Family of Orientation

The areas of ethnicity to be investigated and the specific items measuring them are examined here.

Contact with Mexico: "Where were your parents born? (Give the town and state.)" The assumption here is that an individual both of whose parents were born in Mexico would have greater contact with the culture, would identify more strongly with it, and thus would use more Spanish than an individual both of whose parents were born in the United States. An individual one of whose parents was born in Mexico and one in the United States would fall in between.

Roles of the parents and working of women outside the home: (1) "Who is the major money earner in the family?" It was assumed that an individual whose father is the major money earner would be more strongly identified with the subculture and would use more Spanish than an individual for whom the major money earner in the family was anyone else (given that the father is living). (2) "Is your father (or stepfather) presently employed outside the home?" Here

the assumption is that an individual whose father is working or looking for work would be more strongly identified with the subculture and would use more Spanish than an individual whose father is not. (3) "Is your mother (or stepmother) presently employed outside the home?" The assumption in this case is that an individual whose mother is not working or looking for work would be more strongly identified with the subculture and would use more Spanish than an individual whose mother is working or looking for work.

Divorce: "What is the marital status of your mother and father?" Here it is assumed that of the individuals both of whose parents are living, one whose parents are living together would be most strongly identified with the subculture and would use most Spanish, one whose parents are separated would be less identified and would use less Spanish, and one whose parents were divorced would be least identified and would use least Spanish.

Education: "What was the highest school grade completed by your father and mother?" In this case it was assumed that an individual whose father had more education than his mother would be most identified with the subculture and would use most Spanish, one whose parents had equal amounts, less so, and one whose mother had more education than his father, least of all.

Family: Aspirations for Future Family of Procreation

Importance of family relative to other goals and involvements: Respondents were asked to rank a series of life goals, and it was assumed that the closer to "1" the rank assigned to the goal "to

get married and raise a family," the more identified with the subculture the individual, and the more Spanish he would use.

Desire to marry: "Do you want to get married some day?" Here the assumption is that an individual who wants to marry or is married would be more identified with the subculture and use more Spanish than an individual who does not want to marry.

Ideal family size: "How many children do you want? It was assumed in this case that the more children an individual wanted, the more he identified with the subculture and the more Spanish he would use.

Working of women outside the home: for girls, "What do you want to do about work outside the home after you are married?" and for boys, "If you get married would you want your wife to work outside the home?" It is assumed here that an individual who did not want the wife to work at all would be most identified with the subculture and would use most Spanish, with responses of willingness for the wife to work increasing amounts indicating successively less identification, and less use of Spanish.

Controls and Statistical Analysis*

Because language usage is known to be influenced by a multitude of variables, it was considered important to control as many of these as possible. Available in the data, and selected for consideration as tentative controls either because of the sampling procedure used

---

* The computer program used for the control analysis was the GLHYP, Version 9.01/69. For the main analysis, the Zerbe Least Squares was used.

in collecting the data or on the basis of their theoretical importance were the following variables: sex, county, place of residence (city, town, country-non-farm, farm), and high school. A Riedwyl Goodness of Fit Test for normality of the data (Table 5) indicated that the use of the parametric analysis of variance would be valid here. It was concluded on the basis of the Anova (Table 6) that sex and county should be statistically controlled. However, only the sex variable will be incorporated into the discussion as county is presumed to have no theoretical importance. The Anova will be used also in the main analysis.

RESULTS

Characteristics of Family of Orientation

Birthplace of parents

The F-test (Table 8) yielded a value significant at a very high level for both sexes (for males, $.001 > P > .0005$; for females, $P < .0005$). The table of means shows that for both males and females, the mean index of language usage decreases from left to right. The magnitude of the significant difference in means in index points is not especially great for the males (1.5 index points) but is quite large for the females (4 index points). Thus the significant differences found by the F-test exist in the direction predicted by the hypothesis, and the general hypothesis of a correlation between preference of Spanish and identification with the subculture is upheld in this case.

Table 5. Riedwyl Goodness of Fit Test: Frequency Distribution for Index by Sex.

Index	Males	Females	Total
4	5	13	18
5	7	16	23
6	9	12	21
7	3	7	10
8	19	24	43
9	16	14	30
10	39	35	74
11	27	31	58
12	43	36	79
13	19	28	47
14	45	29	74
15	7	15	22
16	31	18	49
17	1	3	4
18	12	12	24
19	0	0	0
20	6	8	14
Total	289	301	590

$n^2Tn = 31^1 = .05$

Note: In this table and in the frequency and percentage distribution tables in the Appendix, there are no respondents with an index value of 19. This is because such a value is an arithmetic impossibility given that the three possible code values are 1, 3, and 5, and the weighting of the items in the index which was utilized.

[1]The hypothesis of normality could not be rejected as this value was not found to be statistically significant.

Table 6. Analysis of Variance With Respect to Index of Language Usage.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Sex	1	90.1521	90.15	7.28[1]
County	3	172.063	57.35	4.63[2]
High School in County	3	73.9465	24.65	1.99[3]
Place of Residence	3	71.2038	23.73	1.92[4]
Pooled Interactions	38	522.825	13.76	1.11
Within	541	6697.98	12.38	
Total	589	7635.33	12.96	

[1]The sex variable was found to be significant at a level of .01>P>.005.

[2]The county variable was found to be significant at a level of .005>P>.001.

[3]The high school in county variable was found to be not significant for P = .10.

[4]The place of residence variable was found to be not significant for P = .10.

Major money earner

The F-test (Table 9) failed to yield a significant statistic for either males or females, and thus the hypothesis was not upheld by the data for either.

Employment of the father

The F-test (Table 10) indicates a rather highly significant difference between the two treatments for the males ($.05>p>.025$) but the table of means indicates that the difference is in the direction contrary to that predicted by the hypothesis. The mean index of language usage is higher for those respondents whose father is not working or looking for work, rather than the reverse. For the females, there was also a significant difference found between the two groups, and the difference is in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. However, as the table of means demonstrates, the magnitude of the difference is small (only about .44 index points). This difference is not considered to be meaningful. Thus the hypothesis is not supported by the females and is strongly contradicted by the males.

Employment of the mother

The F-test (Table 11) yielded a significant value of the statistic for the males ($.10>p>.05$). The table of means supports this result in that the mean index of language usage is higher for those respondents whose mother is not working or looking for work than for the others. This significant difference, though not especially large (1 index point), is thus in the direction predicted by the

hypothesis. The value of F yielded by the data of the females was not significant. Thus in this case, the hypothesis is supported by the males but not by the females.

Marital status of parents

The F-test (Table 12) yielded a significant value of F for both males and females (.10>P>.05). But as before, the table of means shows the significant difference to be not in the pattern predicted by the hypothesis. According to the hypothesis, the mean indices of language usage should decrease from left to right across the table. However, as shown in the table, the lowest mean index was achieved by those males whose parents are separated, and the intermediate value of the mean index, by those whose parents are divorced. The highest mean index, on the other hand, was achieved as predicted by those whose parents are living together. Thus the hypothesis was not supported by either males or females, although it should be noted that the group of males whose paretns are living together did support the hypothesis. However, the difference between their mean index and that of the males whose parents are divorced (.57 index points) would probably not be shown to be significant.

Relative education of parents

The F-test (Table 13) on this item yielded a statistic for the males which was not significant. For the females, the statistic was highly significant (.025>P>.01). However, once again examination of the table of means indicates that the significant difference found between the treatments is not in the direction predicted by

the hypothesis. Rather, the highest mean index is that of the "Equal amounts" category of respondents. Likewise contradictory to the hypothesis is the fact that of the other two categories, that of "Mother's education greater" has a higher mean than "Father's education greater." Thus the data for neither the males nor the females support the hypothesis.

Aspirations for Future Family of Procreation

Relative importance of family

The F-test (Table 14) in this case yielded a significant result for the males (.10>P>.05). However, the mean indices for the males increase with great regularity from left to right, that is, in the direction opposite to that predicted by the hypothesis. The F-value for females was not significant. Thus the data in this case do not support the hypothesis for either sex.

Desire to marry

Likewise in this case, the F-test (Table 15) failed to yield a significant result for either males or females. Thus the data fail to support the hypothesis.

Desire of males for wife to work

The F-test (Table 16) failed to yield a significant statistic and the hypothesis was not supported.

Desire of females to work after marriage

In contrast, the F-test (Table 17) in this case yielded a rather highly significant value (.025>P>.01). As well, the table of means shows this difference to be in the direction predicted, fairly

large (2.5 index points) and highly regular as well. The values for the mean index decrease from left to right as the involvement with work of the females increases, thus supporting the hypothesis.

Ideal family size

The F-test (Table 18) yielded a rather highly significant result for the males (.025>P>.01). Examination of the table of means demonstrates that this difference is generally in the direction predicted by the hypothesis and is quite large. The smallest ideal family size (1 child) category has likewise the lowest mean index of language usage. The values then jump sharply to about 12, increase to about 13 at the family size 5, and generally stay there, with one exception (7 children). It should be noted, however, that this category has only 3 respondents in it. Thus this data for the males may be said to support the hypothesis. The F-test for the females likewise yielded a highly significant result (.05>P>.025) but examination of the table of means shows that this significance was probably produced in great part by the value in the category "7", where the mean index is the highest possible, 20. This category, though, contains only one respondent, and if it is ignored, the predicted trend still does not exist; there is no semblance of a regular increase in the value of the mean index from left to right. Thus while the data of the males does support the hypothesis, that of the females does not.

Table 8. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Birthplace of Parents.[1]

	Anova		Birthplace of Parents: Mean Index			
Sex of R	F	P	Both in Mexico	One in US/ One in Mexico	Both in US	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points: Approximate
Males	6.96*	.001>P>.0005	13.47	12.43	12.02	1.5
Females	8.29*	P=.0005	14.41	12.44	10.58	4

[1]See Appendix D and corresponding table number for complete analysis of variance for this and all succeeding items.

Table 9. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Major Money Earner.

Major Money Earner

Anova			Mean Index	
Sex of R	F	P	Father	Other
Males	2.66	P=.10	12.11	13.06
Females	1.52	P=.10	11.63	11.61

Table 10. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Employment of Father.

Employment of Father

Anova			Mean Index	
Sex of R	F	P	Working or Looking for work	Not working or looking for work
Males	4.96*	.05>P>.025	12.10	13.71
Females	2.88*	.10>P>.05	11.63	11.19

Table 11. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Employment of Mother.

	Employment of Mother				
	Anova		Mean Index		
Sex of R	F	P	Working or looking for work	Not working or looking for work	Magnitude of Differences in Index Points: Approximate
Males	2.98*	.10>P>.05	11.63	12.65	1
Females	.154	P=.10	11.31	11.78	

Table 12. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Marital Status of Parents (where both are alive).

	Marital Status of Parents				
	Anova		Mean Index		
Sex of R	F	P	Living Together	Separated	Divorced
Males	2.57*	.10>P>.05	12.37	7.87	11.80
Females	2.80*	.10>P>.05	11.65	11.85	10.40

Table 13. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Education of Parents.

	Relative Education of Parents				
	Anova		Mean Index		
Sex of R	F	P	Father's Greater Than Mother's	Equal Amounts for both	Mother's Greater Than Father's
Males	1.87	P=.10	11.99	12.74	11.87
Females	3.85*	.025>P>.01	10.62	12.39	11.37

Table 14. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Importance of Family.

	Relative Importance of Family								
	Anova		Mean Index						
Sex of R	F	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Males	1.86*	.10>P>.05	10.56	11.43	11.74	11.83	12.86	12.83	12.26
Females	1.35	P=.10	12.40	12.12	10.14	11.56	12.44	11.25	11.72

Table 15. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Desire to Marry.

	Desire to Marry			
	Anova		Mean Index	
Sex of R	F	P	Desires to Marry or is now Married	Does not Desire to Marry
Males	.161	P=.10	12.29	12.04
Female	.359	P=.10	11.60	11.74

Table 16. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males With Respect to Desire for Wife to Work.

		Desire for Wife to Work				
		Anova	Mean Index			
F	P	Not Work	Part-time til Child	Full-time til Child	Part-time After Children	Full-time After Children
.43	P=.10	12.38	11.68	12.46	11.75	11.83

Table 17. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Females With Respect to Desire to Work After Marriage.

Anova		Desire to Work After Marriage Mean Index					
F	P	Not Work	Part-time til Child	Full-time til Child	Part-time After Children	Full-time After Children	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points: Approximate
3.3*	.025>P>.01	13.32	11.18	11.03	10.72	10.80	2.5

Table 18. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Ideal Family Size.

	Anova		Ideal Family Size Mean Index								
Sex of R	F	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 or More	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points: Approximate
Males	2.42*	.025>P>.01	6.67	12.25	11.77	11.90	12.92	13.69	11.56	13.09	6.5
Females	2.17*	.05>P>.025	15.20	12.06	11.32	11.11	12.67	11.81	20.00	8.48	

Summary

The results are complex, and are therefore summarized in Table 19. In general the hypothesis was not supported by this data. The following cases, however, were exceptions to that pattern and did support the hypothesis:

1. Birthplace of parents; males and females
2. Employment of the mother; males
3. Desire of females to work after marriage
4. Ideal family size; males

The magnitude of the significant difference found in these cases varied from a small one in the second instance to a quite large one in the fourth.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

As always in the face of an unsupported hypothesis, many questions must be asked before it is concluded that the hypothesis actually does not reflect reality. As was pointed out, the indicators of both language usage and of ethnicity may be questioned in the extent to which they tap the varied universe. But even in view of their limitations, they seem to be fairly well constructed and straightforward. Therefore, until the knowledge of the Mexican American subculture is rendered more objective, until better indicators of ethnicity are developed, and until the measurement of language usage is more refined, it will be concluded that the hypothesis under test here simply does not reflect reality; language usage is not a valid indicator of ethnic identification.

The exceptions must be explored, however. In the case of

Table 19. Summary of Results

Variable Under Consideration	Results of Statistical Evaluation			Support of Hypothesis
	Significant F value	Direction of Difference as Predicted	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points Approximate:	
1. Birthplace of parents	M, Yes F, Yes	Yes Yes	1.5 4	Yes Yes
2. Major money earner	M, No F, No	No		No
3. Employment of the father	M, Yes F, Yes	No Yes	.44[1]	No No
4. Employment of the mother	M, Yes F, No	Yes	1	Yes No
5. Marital status of parents	M, Yes F, Yes	No No		No No
6. Relative education of parents	M, No F, Yes	No No		No No
7. Relative importance of family	M, Yes F, No	No		No
8. Desire to marry	M, No F, No			No

Table 19. Summary of Results (continued)

Variable Under Consideration	Results of Statistical Evaluation			Support of Hypothesis
	Significant F Value	Direction of Difference as Predicted	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points: Approximate	
9. Desire of males for wife to work	No			No
10. Desire of females to work after marriage	Yes	Yes	2.5	Yes
11. Ideal family size	M, Yes F, Yes	Yes	6.5	Yes

[1]It was decided that differences in magnitude of less than one index point would not be interpreted as sociologically meaningful. This is clearly an arbitrary cut-off point.

"Birthplace of parents," the explanation may lie in the fact that the indicator of contact with Mexico is simply too gross to be valid. However, it may also be that this indicator is more firmly founded in sociolinguistic theory concerning how the young acquire their culture than others. In that case the contrasting results obtained for it and the majority of the other indicators would bring into question the current understanding of the subculture. Until that understanding is improved, however, the first explanation will have to be accepted.

The exceptional case "Employment of mother" for the males was based upon the same assumptions as were the items "Major money earner" and "Employment of father." The most reasonable explanation for the difference in result lies in the probability that males and females do not respond to the "machismo" ethic in the same way. It may be that the employment of the mother challenges the young male, in whom the notion of male dominance is firmly ingrained, in a way that it does not challange the female. Her role as future mother and homemaker is not undermined by her mother's working, while the role of the male is severely undercut. The same result might have been obtained in the case of "Major money earner" had the "Mother" category" been separated from the general "Other." The unemployment of the father may be seen as involuntary and thus carry no implications for either males or females. Thus in the case of "Employment of mother," because of the particular strain involved for the male, language usage could be used as an indicator

of the male's identification with the subculture.

The case of "Desire of females to work" involves aspirations rather than ascribed characteristics. In this instance the female has been forced to place herself in response categories, and has thus put herself under an active strain in her relation to the subculture, much as occurred with the males in the former case. She is actively contradicting the subculture by desiring to work after marriage, and thus her language usage is an indicator of her ethnic identification. The males are not so intensely involved with this problem because they are placing their future wives, not themselves, in categories, and, even in view of the "machismo" ethic, are thus more passive participants.

In the case of "Ideal family size" as well, it seems that males and females should not have been expected to respond in the same way to the culture. It may be here that the male has a stake in a large family which the female does not. The larger his family, the greater the proof of his virility, of his "machismo." The female not only is not affected by this consideration, but as she will have almost sole responsibility for the rearing of her family, she may be tempted to limit the size of her family, in spite of the Catholic proscription of birth control.

These four exceptional cases, then, all provide instances in which language may be used as a valid indicator of ethnicity, for various reasons. The fact that they were exceptional emphasizes the fact that language usage is not generally valid, and only through detailed empirical investigation may the cases where this is pos-

sibly be ferreted out. The culture is simply too complex to be dealt with otherwise.

The implications of this conclusion for sociolinguistic theory are apparent: the naive notion of the general validity of language usage as an indicator of ethnicity must be abandoned, and replaced by a more sophisticated approach which would involve investigation of each individual bilingual subculture before use of language in this way. The effect of language usage upon such things as mobility should be explored theoretically, with attention to the following areas: 1) Relative use of Spanish and English in various domains; and 2) English language ability, regardless of amount of use.

The implications of the conclusion here relative to the Kuvlesky and Patella study (1970) is that, until the subculture is understood more thoroughly, their results and those of similar studies (i.e. Nall, 1961) should be interpreted in a less sweeping sense. As was remarked above, language usage, though not generally applicable as an indicator of ethnicity, is still a meaningful variable in its own right. The knowledge that the expected negative correlation between language usage and mobility aspirations does not exist extends our understanding of the subculture and demands further investigation of it. Future research should focus upon 1) language usage, seeking to determine how it is best tapped for this subculture in particular, and for bilingual subcultures in general, and 2) ethnicity, aiming to discover empirically just what are the salient aspects of the Mexican American subculture, the "true" indicators of ethnic

identification, both behavioral, and non-behavioral. This latter area is a very promising but largely unexplored one. Methodology, as well, should focus on these two areas, as innovative new tools for both are desperately needed.

The most direct social application of the findings of this study is to the educational world, a critical one today for many Mexican American youngsters, as well as members of other bilingual minorities such as the Indians. Teachers must no longer assume that because they perceive the language usage patterns of their students, they are equipped to extrapolate them to all other aspects of the students' attitudes and values. It may well be found ultimately that, for a given subculture, language is a powerful correlate of many aspects of an individual's outlook and behavior. However, at this point in time, the nature of those correlations is not known. Therefore no teacher attempting to deal with a bilingual youngster should assume that because "Juan" is very quiet except with his friends, and then he speaks only Spanish, he necessarily has any particular set of attitudes concerning his own ethnicity or toward the dominant culture. The interaction of language and culture is a complex one. The following case may well exist: one particular youngster may speak predominantly Spanish, consider himself more Mexican than American, and reject certain aspects of Anglo culture while adopting others. A second youngster may speak predominantly English, and yet have exactly the same conformation of attitudes as the other. Likewise two students may use just the same amount

of Spanish and have widely differing outlooks on life. Teachers today, given the state of knowledge on the subject, simply cannot claim to understand their students' values, attitudes and behavior patterns just be hearing the language that comes out of their mouths; teachers must maintain open minds. Too often in the past minority youngsters have become victims of a self-fulfilling prophecy made by the teacher concerning their probable success in the school (Deutsch, 1967). This unfortunate waste can be decreased significantly if teachers can manage to free themselves of ill-founded stereotypes such as those based on language usage. The implications for employers of Mexican Americans parallel those for teachers.

More generally, these results point toward the need for social policy, particularly in education, to direct itself toward giving the people of Mexican American heritage an even chance in this society. In the past the schools have perpetrated a misguided effort to force acculturation upon the members of this subculture (as well as others). As a result, acculturation has occurred to a high degree; witness the high mobility aspirations held by Mexican American youth in spite of the particularistic-ascriptive nature of the subculture (Juarez, 1968). However, this acculturation has been achieved at the price of great violence to both a rich cultural heritage and to the individuals who should be its proud bearers. (Needless to say, there is a certain bias on the part of the author coloring this evaluation. But unless one believes that cultural subgroups in this country must be forced to blend in with dominant culture to the

point of rendering themselves indistinguishable from its other members, the bias is not an extreme one.) In the past many educators have opposed bilingual education for fear that teaching of the Spanish language, and of the culture, would prevent acculturation (Andersson, 1969:72). However, this study has demonstrated that language is not a reliable predictor of ethnic identification, or of any attitudes or beliefs we know of yet, so educators should not fear bilingual education on these grounds. Moreover, the acculturation which has begun will surely continue, and there is much reason to believe that were the educational experience of young Mexican Americans made more meaningful for them, they would achieve greater success in Anglo schools, and thus in the Anglo society (Spilerman, 1971:114). Bilingual education, then, should be encouraged and expanded, and the sooner the better, with the goal being to provide bilingual education for all interested Mexican American youth, and members of other subcultures as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Theodore.
1969 Hispania "Bilingual schooling: Oasis or mirage?" 52:69-74.

Barber, Carroll.
1952 "Trilingualism in Pascua: Social functions of language in an Arizona Yaqui Village." Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Arizona.

Barker, George C.
1945 "The social functions of language." Etcetera 2:228-234.

Bronsnahan, L. F.
1963 "Some aspects of the linguistic situation in tropical Africa." Lingua 12:54-65.

Burma, John H.
1954 Spanish-speaking groups in the United States. Durham: Duke University Press.

Christian, Jane Macwab and Chester, Jr.
1966 "Spanish language and culture in the Southwest." Pp. 280-317 in Joshua Fishman (ed.), Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Deutsch, Martin.
1967 "Some psychological aspects of learning in the disadvantaged." Pp. 320-326 in E. Paul Torrance and Robert D. Strom (ed.). Mental health and achievement. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Edmonson, Munro S.
1957 Los manitos: A study of institutional values. New Orleans: Middle American Research Institute, Tulane University.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M.
1968 "An analysis of the interaction of language, topic, and listener." Pp. 192-211 in Joshua Fishman (ed.), Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1966 Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.
1966 "Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry." Pp. 424-454 in Joshua Fishman (ed.), Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.
1968 Readings in the sociology of language. The Hauge: Mouton.

Fishman, Joshua A., and Vladimir C. Nahirny.
1966 "The ethnic group school in the United States." Pp. 306-317 in Joshua A. Fishman, (ed.), Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Gonzales, Nancie.
1967 The Spanish Americans of New Mexico: A distinctive heritage. Los Angeles: Mexican American Study Project, University of California at Los Angeles.

Haugen, Einar.
1954 "Some pleasures and problems of bilingual research." International journal of American linguistics 20:116-122.

Hayden, Robert G.
1966 "Some community dynamics of language maintenance." Pp. 190-205 in Joshua Fishman (ed.), Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Heller, Celia S.
1966 Mexican American Youth: Forgotten youth at the crossroads. New York: Random House.

Herman, S. N.
1961 "Explorations in the social psychology of language choice." Human Relations 14:149-164.

Hohenthal, W. D., and Thomas McCorkle.
1955 "The problem of aboriginal persistence." Southwestern journal of anthropology 11:283-300.

Hoijer, Harry.
1964 "Linguistic and cultural change." Pp. 45-462 in Dell Hymes (ed.), Language in culture and society. New York: Harper and Row.

Hymes, Dell.
1964 "General introduction." Language in culture and society. New York: Harper and Row.
1968 "The ethnography of speaking." Pp. 99-133 in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Johnston, Ruth.
1963 "Factors in the assimilation of selected groups of Polish post-war immigrants in Western Australia," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Western Australia (Perth).

Jones, Robert C.
1948 "Ethnic family patterns: The Mexican family in the United States." American journal of sociology 53:450-452.

Kloss, Heinz.
1966 "German American language maintenance efforts." Pp. 205-252 in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Kroeber, A. L.
1964 "Foreword." Pp. xvii-xix in Dell Hymes (ed.), Language in culture and society. New York: Harper and Row.

Kuhn, Walter.
1934 Deutsche Sprechinsel-Forschung. Plauen: Gunther Wolff.

Kuvlesky, William P., and Victoria M. Patella.
1970 "Strength of ethnic identification and intergenerational mobility aspirations among Mexican American youth." Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association meetings, Dallas, March 26-28, 1970.

Lambert, Wallace.
1955 "Development of the linguistic dominance of bilinguals." Journal of abnormal and social psychology 50:197-200.

Lambert, W. E., Gardner, R. C., Olton, R., and K. Tunstall.
1968 "A study of the roles of attitudes and motivation in second-language learning." Pp. 473-491 in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Leach, Edmund R.
1965 "Culture and social cohesion: An anthropologist's view." Daedalus 94:24-38.

Obordo, Angelista S.
1968 "Status orientations toward family development: A racial comparison of adolescent girls from low-income rural areas." Unpublished Master's thesis. Texas A&M University.

Mackey, W. F.
1956 "Toward a redefinition of bilingualism." Journal of the Canadian linguistic association 2:8.

Madsen, William.
1964 The Mexican Americans of South Texas. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Nall, Frank C., II.
1962 "Role expectations: A cross-cultural study." Rural sociology. 27:28-41.

Orans, Martin.
1950 "A tribe in search of a great tradition. The emulation-solidarity conflict." Man in India 30:108-114.

Parson, Talcott.
1951 The social system. New York: The Free Press.

Penalosa, Fernando.
1963 "Class consciousness and social mobility in a Mexican American community." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Southern California.
1968 "Mexican family roles." Journal of marriage and the family 30:680-689.

Ramirez, Manual.
1967 "Identification With Mexican family values and authoritarianism in Mexican Americans." The journal of social psychology 73:3-11.

Rubin, Joan.
1968 "Bilingual usage in Paraguay." Pp. 512-530 in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Samora, Julian, and Wm. N. Deane.
1956 "Language usage as a possible index of acculturation." sociology and social research 40:307-311.

Schmidt-Rohr, George.
1933 Mutter sprache. Jena: Euquen Diederichs Verlag.

Skrabanek, R. L.
1969 "Language maintenance among Mexican Americans." Unpublished paper, Texas A&M University.

Speed, F. W., and W. B. Smith.
1969 "Riedwyl's goodness of fit with unknown parameters." Unpublished manuscript, Institute of Statistics, Texas A&M University.

Spencer, John.
1963 Language in Africa. (ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spilerman, Seymour.
1971 "Raising academic motivation in lower class adolescents: A convergence of two research traditions." Sociology of education 44:103-118.

Tuck, Ruth.
1946 Not with the fist. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Weinreich, Uriel.
1953 Languages in contact. New York: Linguistic circle of New York.

INSTRUMENTS

Mexican American Identity and Language Usage

28. Are you of Spanish-American ancestry? (Circle one number.)

1 Yes 2 No

---

29. a) Do you speak Spanish? (Circle one number.)

1 Yes 2 No

If you answered <u>yes</u>, you do speak Spanish, answer the following questions:

b) What language do you usually use when speaking with your parents? (Circle one number.)

1 English 2 Spanish 3 About the same amount of both

c) What language do you usually use when talking with your close friends in your neighborhood? (Circle one number.)

1 English 2 Spanish 3 About the same amount of both

d) What language do you usually use when speaking with your close school friends outside the class? (Circle one number.)

1 English 2 Spanish 3 About the same of both

---

30. How many of the radio programs you listen to are broadcast in Spanish?

1 None 2 Some 3 More-than-half 4 All

---

31. How many of the magazines and newspapers which you read are in Spanish?

1 None 2 Some 3 More-than half 4 All

Characteristics of Family of Orientation

32. Where were your parents born? (give the town and state.)

Mother_____

Father_____

25. Who is the major money earner in the family? (Circle one number):

1 Father

2 Mother

3 Brother or sister

4 Other (Who?_____)

5 Insurance, social security, or something like this

24. Is your father (or stepfather) presently employed outside the home? (Circle one number):

1 Yes, full-time

2 Yes, part-time

3 No, but is looking for work

4 No, does not work and is not looking for work outside the home

5 Have no father or stepfather

6 Don't know

23. Is your mother (or stepmother) presently employed outside the home? (Circle one number):

1 Yes, full-time

2 Yes, part-time

3 No, but is looking for work

4 No, does not work and is not looking for work outside the home

5 Have no mother or stepmother

6 Don't know

20. What is the marital status of your mother and father? (Circle one number):

1 Both alive, living together

2 Both alive, separated

3 Both alive, divorced

4 Father not living

5 Mother not living

6 Neither father nor mother living

22. What was the highest school grade completed by your father and mother? (Circle one number for father and one number for mother.)

Father		Mother
1	Did not go to school	1
2	Grade 1 - 7	2
3	Eighth grade	3
4	Some high school but didn't graduate	4
5	Graduated from high school	5
6	Went to Vocational School after graduating from high school	6
7	Some college but didn't graduate	7
8	College graduate (4 years)	8

9 Don't know 9

Aspirations for Future Family of Procreation

27. Listed below are a number of things that most young people look forward to. Rank them in order of their importance to you. For the one you think is most important put a number 1 in front of it; for the next most important one put a number 2; and so on until you have a different number (from 1 to 7) for each one. Read over the entire list before answering the question.

____To have lots of free time to do what I want.

____To get all the education I want.

____To earn as much money as I can.

____To get the job I want most.

____To live in the kind of place I like best.

____To have the kind of house, car, furniture, and other things like this I want.

____To get married and raise a family.

CHECK YOUR ANSWERS! You should have used each number from 1 to 7 only one time and you should have a number in each blank space.

8. (a) Do you want to get married some day?
(Circle one number):

1 Yes 2 No 3 Already married

(b) How many children do you <u>want</u>?

G-3 (a) What do you want to do about work outside the home after you are married? (Circle one number.)

(b) What do you actually expect to do about work outside the home after you are married? (Circle one number.)

<u>Want</u>	<u>Expect</u>
1 Not work outside the home at all	
2 Work part-time until I have a child	
3 Work full-time until I have a child	
4 Work part-time even after I have children	
5 Work full-time even after I have children	

<u>BOYS ONLY ANSWER THIS QUESTION</u>!

B-1 (a) If you get married, would you want your wife to work outside the home? (Circle one number.)

(b) If you get married, do you think (expect) your wife will work outside the home? (Circle one number.)

Want		Expect
1	Not work outside the home at all	1
2	Work part-time until we have a child	2
3	Work full-time until we have a child	3
4	Work part-time even after we have children	4
5	Work full-time even after we have children	5

Controls: Sex and Place of Residence

2. Sex (Circle one number: 1 Male 2 Female

4. Where have you lived most of your life?
(Circle one number):

1 City (over 2,500)

2 Town or village (under 2,500)

3 In the country, but not on a farm

4 On a farm